R E P O R T  R E S U M E S

ED 020 785 PS 000 981

PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION.

BY- GETZELS, J.W.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.48 10P.

DESCRIPTORS- PRESCHOOL CHILDREN, *PRESCHOOL EDUCATION, *EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION, PRESCHOOL LEARNING, COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT, *CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED, DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, ENRICHMENT, LOW ACHIEVEMENT FACTORS, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION, EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED, CHILD DEVELOPMENT, CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT, *ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES, EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT, SCHOOL ORIENTATION,

THESE ISSUES SHOULD BE DISCUSSED AND RESOLVED BEFORE A LARGE-SCALE INTRODUCTION OF PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS FOR CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN--(1) THE EFFECT OF ENVIRONMENT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOOL-RELATED ABILITIES. NUMEROUS STUDIES ATTEST TO THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PRESCHOOL YEARS IN ESTABLISHING THE BASIC SKILLS ESSENTIAL TO SUCCESS IN SCHOOL. (2) AT WHAT AGE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR SCHOOL-RELATED EXPERIENCES MUST BE AVAILABLE IN THE ENVIRONMENT. STUDIES WITH ANIMALS AND CONGENITALLY BLIND PEOPLE GIVEN SIGHT BY OPERATION INDICATE THAT BASIC SKILLS ARE DEVELOPED QUITE EARLY. (3) THE DIFFERENCES IN THE CONTINUITY OR DISCONTINUITY OF PRESCHOOL EXPERIENCES AND SCHOOL EXPECTATIONS BETWEEN CULTURALLY DEPRIVED AND NONDEPRIVED CHILDREN. THE LANGUAGE OF THE DEPRIVED CHILD TENDS TO BE RESTRICTED IN DEVELOPMENT AND SIMPLE IN STRUCTURE. THE LANGUAGE REQUIRED BY THE SCHOOL IS RICH AND COMPLEX. THE SCHOOL REQUIRES AN ACHIEVEMENT ETHIC, WITH HIGH VALUATION ON DEFERRED GRATIFICATION AND SYMBOLIC COMMITMENT. THE LOWER CLASS CHILD HAS A SET OF VALUES BASED ON IMMEDIATE GRATIFICATION AND CONCRETE COMMITMENT. (4) THE NATURE OF COMPENSATORY PRESCHOOL EDUCATION AND SOME OF THE CURRENT PROCEDURAL ISSUES. THE PRESENT VARIETY OF TYPES OF PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS REPRESENT THREE APPROACHES--(A) SUPPLEMENTARY, (B) ACADEMIC-PREPARATORY, AND (C) COMPENSATORY. (5) SOME OF THE LONG-RANGE UNDERLYING ISSUES. SO-CALLED DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN MAY HAVE CERTAIN ASSETS AND ABILITIES WHICH MIDDLE CLASS CHILDREN DO NOT POSSESS. THESE ASSETS MAY HAVE SIGNIFICANT INTRINSIC VALUE FOR SOCIETY AS A WHOLE, BUT THEY MAY BE WIPED OUT IF IMPOSED UPON BY THE MIDDLE CLASS ORIENTED SCHOOLS. THERE ARE NUMEROUS CRITICS WHO CLAIM THAT THE SCHOOLS TODAY ARE EDUCATIONALLY DEFECTIVE. THIS ARTICLE IS A REPRINT FROM "FOCUS," (N.D.), MASSACHUSETTS COUNCIL FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS, INC., 16 ARLINGTON ST., BOSTON, MASS., 02116. (WD)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FOCUS

an Information Service

of the Massachusetts Council for Public Schools, Inc.

16 Arlington St., Boston, Mass. 02116

ED020785

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AS RECEIVED FROM THE OR OPINIONS OF EDUCATION

As you can see, FOCUS has a new face. It also has a new function. Rather than printing original articles in journal form as we have done during the past few years, FOCUS will now bring you educational news and views of pertinence and importance.

There will be no schedule for distribution. FOCUS will come to you more often than in the past — as often as we discover information which we feel should be disseminated.

We hope you will enjoy and profit from this new service of the Massachusetts Council for Public Schools.

*The following article was prepared by Dr. Getzels as one of the Consultants' Papers for the recently held White House Conference on Education.*

RECEIVED

MAR 28 1968

# Pre-School Education

Consultant: J. W. GETZELS, Professor of Education, University of Chicago

Let me say at once that I have not myself worked with pre-school children in the educational setting. But this is not without some advantage in a paper whose primary intent is to raise issues rather than to settle them, for I am not already so committed to a particular theoretical or pedagogic point of view that any other is immediately unacceptable, if not altogether inconceivable.

That there is a crucial need for change in the educational provisions for the lower class or culturally deprived child hardly bears argument. We need not belabor the point here. Nor is the need an entirely new one, although the wonder and tragedy is that we have just got around to doing anything about it in a concerted way. *Middletown*[19] in the late twenties, *Who Shall Be Educated*[25] in the early forties *Social Class Influences on Learning*[7] in the late forties all dealt with this issue. Indeed, more than a generation ago the Lynds showed that at least in Middletown by the time a child entered school he was already typed intellectually by economic status. Although only 13.4% of the Business Class children in the first grade were below 90 in IQ, fully 42.5% of the Working Class children were below this level in the same grade. The Lynds raised the question then in essentially the terms we are doing to-day: to what extent was this observed difference in intelligence a reflection of the "modification of native endowment by varying environmental conditions" ([19], p. 36).

PS 000981

Nor were proposals for doing something special for the lower class child in school lacking. Among the proposed lines of attack were: the curriculum should be altered to take into account the experience of these children, education should be differentiated according to their abilities, the existing curriculum should be enriched to enable the lower class child to catch up with the middle class child, and so on. But what all these proposals had in common was that they attempted to work within the prevailing organization of the schools. Their fundamental intent was remedial rather than preventive—to do something *after* the child was in school rather than *before*.

And it is precisely for this reason that these proposals seemed only to pose the dilemma rather than to provide a solution. For they neglected to face up fully to two unavoidable issues. First is the claim for the preeminent impact of early experience, that it is during the early period that the child not only acquires a characteristic set of values, language, and fund of information, but he literally *learns to learn*. He acquires the tools, so to speak, for meeting the problems he will face in school. Second is the claim that the values, language, information, and method of learning acquired by the middle class child is *continuous* with what will be required of him in school; the values, language, information, and method of learning acquired by the lower class child are *discontinuous* with what will be required of him in school. It is as if the one group obtained a set of tools applicable to the school situation, and the other a set of tools *not* applicable to the school situation, but the school expected the two groups to perform as if they had equally applicable tools and resources.

It is in these terms—the problem of learning to learn and the relationship between pre-school experience and educational expectations—that we may raise the following questions:

1. What is the effect of environment on the development of school-related abilities?
2. How early must the opportunity for school-related experiences be available in the environment?
3. What are the differences in the continuity or discontinuity of pre-school experiences and school expectations between culturally-deprived and non-deprived children?
4. What is the nature of compensatory pre-school education, and what are some of the current procedural issues?
5. What are some of the long-range underlying issues?

I need hardly say that I shall not be able in the dozen or so pages at my disposal to deal with these questions in any depth. But I have taken the chairman's charge seriously: in view of the goals of the conference, it is more important for the paper to open for exploration a wide range of issues than to provide conclusions, recommendations, or attempt to settle any one issue definitively.

1. We may begin with what seems to be the fundamental question underlying the entire problem of cultural deprivation and pre-school education: What is the effect of environment on learning to learn?

We have already cited the study of a generation ago by the Lynds showing a cognitive deficit in lower class over upper children. Studies along this line have steadily increased in number, rigor, and specificity of demonstrated relationship. To mention only a sampling: Irwin[17] found a systematic relationship between mastery of speech sounds in infants 1 to 30 months of age and the occupational status of the family; Milner[20] found a significant relationship between the reading readiness of first grade children and the "verbal environment" at home; Montague[21] found a similar relationship between the arithmetic concepts of kindergarten children and the socio-economic status of their families; and, in a notable series of

studies, Deutsch and his colleagues[6] have gone a step further in specificity and shown that not only are there differences in cognitive performance between social-class and race groups but within the groups, a "particular level of cognitive performance reflects certain specific environmental characteristics"; Hess[14] has shown the same relationship for the acquisition of language and the nature of the mother-child interaction. In short, numerous studies attest to the view that the development of both general and specific cognitive abilities—the abilities required for success in school—is determined in many critical ways by the availability of relevant experiences in the pre-school environment.

2. We may turn to the second question that seems to be crucial: How *early* must the opportunity for the relevant experience be available? Is, for example, the present school age—the magic number six—time enough? We know very little about this for any specific ability nor, of course, in view of different rates of maturation, for any given individual. Nonetheless, an increasing number of studies are showing that it is the lack of *early* experience that may be most damaging, not only to such psychological abilities as learning but even to such presumably physiological abilities as vision.

The most direct evidence on what we may call the "timing" of experience comes from experiments with animals—experiments that cannot be done with humans. For example, Austen Riesen[22] some years ago deprived animals of light at various stages during their growth. He found that it was deprivation during the early period that resulted in the most serious perceptual deficit. There is, however, relevant if less direct evidence for humans as well. For example, Bloom[4] estimated that the long-term over-all effect of living in a "culturally deprived" as against a "culturally abundant" environment to be 20 IQ points, and hypothesized that this effect was spaced developmentally as follows: from birth to 4 years, 10 IQ units; from 4 to 8 years, 6 IQ units; from 8 to 17 years, 4 IQ units. The rank-order correlation between the hypothesized effects and empirical data from a number of studies was .95, the absolute amount of the observed effects being substantially greater even than the estimates.

But the evidence that is perhaps most dramatically instructive for humans is from the "natural experiments" provided by individuals who were congenitally blind and given sight by surgical operation as adults. As Hebb[12] points out, Senden studied the perceptual behavior of numerous such individuals, and much to his surprise and most people's disbelief, found that these patients literally had to *learn to see*. There was a period when despite no structural defect in sensory apparatus, these persons could not distinguish between a square and a triangle, a sphere and a cube. They had to stop and count the corners one after another just as a young child does. To perceive these objects as whole figures, with distinctive features immediately evident, was not possible for a long time, not because they could not see—note, they could see and count the corners—but because they had not had the necessary *experience in generalizing* from vision.

It is entirely possible that the normal child goes through a similar process of literally learning to perceive, and that as adults we are able to "see" a square or a triangle at a glance as a result of the imperceptible but complex learning we did as children. Much of what may appear as somehow arising "innately"—perception, language, value, what has been called the child's characteristic "learning set" or what I should like to call his "codes for future learning"—is in large measure acquired through the mediation of appropriate multiple and early experiences. The question is not whether there are individual differences that are innate. The point rather is that given the same potentiality for learning at birth, the availability and

timing of experience appear to facilitate or inhibit the expression of the potentiality. And as we have already indicated, there are significant differences in this respect: the relevant experiences tend to be available for some children and not for others. Indeed, the term culturally deprived has been taken to mean lack of availability of such experiences at the appropriate time.

3. This brings us to the third question: What are the differences in the continuity or discontinuity of pre-school experiences and school expectations between culturally deprived and non-deprived children, or more specifically, what is the nature of the differences in the "learning sets" or "codes for future learning" acquired by the two groups?

We have already remarked on such specific differences as are measured by vocabulary, arithmetic, and reading-readiness tests and such general perceptual and cognitive differences as are measured by intelligence tests. Two other salient differences must also be considered in this connection.

There are two general "codes" a child learns through his early contacts with the environment: one is a *language code*, the other a *value code*. The language code gives him the categories for structuring and communicating his experiences. The value code tells him what in his experience is important—worth attending to. In a sense, language becomes the window through which he perceives experience, and values determine what in his experience he will cherish or reject. And it is argued that it is precisely with respect to the character of these crucial codes—the value code and the language code—that the disadvantaged child differs most sharply from the advantaged child and from school requirements.

Explicitly or implicitly, the school requires an *achievement* ethic, with consequent high valuation of the future, deferred gratification, and symbolic commitment. It takes for granted that every child has had an opportunity to experience beliefs that anyone can get to the top, and if he tries he too can get to the top. The future, not the present, is what counts, and one must use the present to prepare for the future. Time therefore must not be wasted—note the vernacular "time is money." It is expected that the child will be able to defer immediate gratification for later gratification through symbolic commitment to "success." Not only are these the values of the school, but they are the values of the environment in which most middle class children are brought up.

In contrast to this, it is pointed out, the lower class child has experienced only a *survival* or *subsistence* ethic (not an achievement ethic) with consequent high valuation on the *present* (not the future) on *immediate gratification* (not deferred gratification) and *concrete commitment* (not symbolic commitment). Where the lower class child lives hardly anyone ever gets to the top—often one can hardly move across the street. And time is not important or potentially valuable if there is not going to be anything to do with it anyway. The commitment is to immediate and concrete gratification—to the satisfactions of here and now—for what does an appeal to symbolic success mean where success is measured only by subsistence or survival? In short, the lower class in contrast to the middle class child may face a severe discontinuity in values upon coming to school—a discontinuity that may have a profound effect on his behavior toward school, and no less an effect on the school's behavior toward him.

What we have said about value is also applicable to language. The work to which I shall refer is by Basil Bernstein,[2] which is consonant with other studies in this area. He argues that different social strata generate different speech systems or linguistic codes, regulating the selection an individual makes from what is available in the language as a whole. These linguistic codes, which develop early and are

stabilized through time, come to play an important role in the intellectual, social, and affective life of the child. There are two language codes: one "elaborated," the other "restricted." In the restricted code, the vocabulary and syntactic structure are drawn from a *narrow* range of possibilities, the organizing elements of the speech are *simple*, and there is *considerable dependence on extra-verbal channels of communication* like gestures. In the elaborated code, the vocabulary and syntactic structure are drawn from a *wide* range of possibilities, the organizing elements of the speech are *complex*, and there is *little reliance on extra-verbal channels of communication:* the message must be given and sought in the verbal material itself.

As may already have been anticipated, a middle class child is likely to experience and acquire an elaborated language code; a lower class child a restricted language code. But the school is of course predominantly concerned with elaborated language codes. Accordingly, in language as in values, for one child school is *continuous* with his early experience, for the other child school is *discontinuous* with his early experience.

It is often said that the lower class child fails in school because he is apathetic or aggressive. Without denying this, some would turn it around and raise the further question whether he is not also increasingly apathetic and aggressive in school because he fails. For what can be more tormenting than to be faced day upon day with a situation you cannot handle and yet may not leave on pain of severe punishment? Insofar as the pre-school experiences of the lower class child have not prepared him for school, school can only be a source of frustration: he is neither ready to do what is required nor can he escape. The reaction to this type of frustration is hopelessness and rage. In school, the hopelessness is manifested in apathy, i.e., psychological withdrawal from the source of frustration, and the rage in aggression, i.e., physical attack upon the source of frustration. Ultimately, not only does this failure lead to dropping-out with consequent unemployability, but the patterns of apathy and aggression maintained over the compulsory school years often become stabilized into deep-seated maladjustment and delinquency.

From this point of view, compensatory pre-school education may be seen as an effort to bring the experience of the lower class child into greater continuity with the expectations of the school—expectations that presuppose middle class value and language codes for its children—not only in order to increase learning but to avoid the frustrating consequences of the discontinuities between the home and the school.

4. We may turn now to the fourth question we posed: What is the nature of the current programs in compensatory pre-school education?

The number and diversity of compensatory pre-school projects are growing so rapidly that it is hazardous to say anything about *the* nature of the programs without risk of over-simplifying and being out of date almost at once. It is more instructive to speak of *alternatives* in the current undertakings. For example, within walking distance of the University of Chicago are several separate programs. One is in a long established predominantly middle-class nursery. The proposed curriculum includes free play, group games, show and tell, and neighborhood trips—activities which do not differ from what is done regularly in this nursery. Another is in the local public school, which has never dealt with nursery or pre-kindergarten children—middle or lower class. Among the stated aims are to give the children experience with the tools of learning—pencils, crayons, books, etc.—and to develop their readiness for regular school activities. A third program, which grew out of a volunteer college student project, was designed specifically for culturally-deprived children. The staff was selected on the basis of experience in pre-school education with such children, and

there is heavy emphasis on auditory and visual discrimination, rhythmics, and self-expression. A fourth program is in a local Montessori School, and will presumably be influenced by its philosophy and methods. From among the Montessori activities are included " 'practical life' projects (e.g., buttoning, tying, cleaning dishes, polishing copper, peeling carrots)" and there is emphasis on the ability "to look at, *see*, and handle materials." Only one of the programs was in existence a year ago.

The diversity and recency that we have seen here in miniature is representative of current pre-school programs at large. An inventory of compensatory education programs—exclusive of Project Head Start—shows pre-schools in operation in some 70 cities.[15] Over half of these have been established within the past year or two. There is diversity in every aspect of the programs: the auspices may be as various as the public school system itself, a national welfare agency, or the local junior league; and, the personnel may range from two teachers, a social worker, two psychologists and a nurse for 32 children to six teachers and 36 teacher-aides for 240 children. The purpose of one program is said to be "to give the children of the poor the *same* experiences that are provided routinely to children of middle and upper-income families: vocabulary, verbal expression, cultural experience, and appreciation of learning"; but, in another the focus is on very different and more primitive activities: "development of listening skills and visual discrimination; provision of activities which engage touch, taste, and smell; and teachers will work with parents in orienting them toward the program and having them assist the development of the child."

Despite the variability in specific activities, the programs may be classified at least for analytic purposes into three broad categories. Explicitly or implicitly, in one the predominant assumption is that the observed deficiencies of the culturally deprived child are more superficial than fundamental—the differences are in quantity rather than in kind—and the pre-school experiences that are needed are *supplementary;* from this point of view, if a nursery or pre-school activity is good for the middle class child it is good also (if perhaps at some simpler level) for the lower class child. In the second, the assumption is that the significant deficiencies reside in the lack of familiarity with school-related objects and activities—say, pencils, books, the use of crayons, following directions—and the pre-school experiences the culturally deprived child needs are predominantly *academic-preparatory*. In the third, the assumption is that because of powerful environmental effects, the culturally deprived child becomes fundamentally different in self-concept, language, value, and perceptual process; from this point of view neither the supplementary not the preparatory activities in themselves are sufficient: what is required are *specialized programs* that will *compensate for*, in the sense of *counteract*, the deleterious environmental effects.[5,9] This diversity raises an obvious and serious issue: Which of the alternatives is likely to be more fruitful than another? It is not that a categorical answer can be forthcoming at once, but dealing with the issue systematically may lead to criteria for selecting activities and evaluating outcomes rather than proceeding by hit or miss.

In view of the theoretical and procedural differences, it might be expected that observations to guide our choice would be abundant. This is unfortunately not so. There are no systematic comparisons of the relative effectiveness, say, of what we have called the supplementary and academic-preparatory procedures. There are no systematic comparisons of the relative effectiveness of different points of intervention within what we have called the specialized programs. Two relevant observations from the research that is available so far, however, can be made. One is that pre-school programs do tend to be effective in raising intelligence test scores, vocabulary

level, expressive ability, arithmetical reasoning, and reading readiness. Independent reports by Bereiter,[1] Gray,[11] the Ypsilanti Public Schools,[26] and the Racine studies[18] all point to one or more of these effects. This is enormously encouraging, even though they used different procedures and it is impossible to say what it is specifically in the pre-schools that accounts for the positive effects. The second observation is less encouraging. Although Deutsch[8] has reported differences in the fifth grade favoring children who attended pre-school over those who did not, two recent experimental studies[12,26] that have followed their pre-school and control children through kindergarten and first grade report that the initial differences tended *not* to be maintained in the regular school situation. The Racine study states bluntly:

> Potentially, the most useful conclusion which can be drawn from these data is that "one shot" compensatory programs would seem to be a waste of time and money. The fact that differences between groups disappeared and that in several areas the rate of growth of both groups regressed during the traditional first grade year supports this contention.
>
> If these implications are supported by future research it would seem that curricular revision over the entire twelve year school curriculum is a necessary part of any lasting solution to the basic problem of urban public school education [18], (p. 53).

It must be emphasized that this is but one study done with only a handful of subjects at the kindergarten rather than earlier period. Nonetheless, the issues raised by the data, tentative as they are, must be taken seriously: Assuming that compensatory pre-school education is effective during the pre-school period, what provisions need to be made in the regular school and in the home to maintain the effectiveness?

The most extensive pre-school undertaking is of course Project Head Start. It represents the awakening of the American conscience to the nation's most serious problem, and we can take pride that a generation hence no one will be able to say as we are about a generation ago that although the problem was recognized nothing courageous to solve it was attempted. But the very significance and massiveness of Head Start raises in urgent form all the issues implicit in the preceding discussion: What, for example, are the criteria for selecting activities from the available alternatives? On what basis will the effectiveness of what is being done be evaluated? Granted, it is difficult to see how any educational harm can come to the children, and there may be residual gains in medical care and keeping them off the streets. And to endeavor more than is presently warranted by our knowledge and capabilities is better than to try less. But this too needs to be considered: May not long-term mischief be done to the idea of compensatory pre-school education if the possible lack of positive educational effects from this type of "one shot" program are immediately attributed to what some like to think is the inevitable failure of lower-class parents to cooperate, the immutability of the abilities of the children, or to the conception of compensatory education itself, rather than to possible shortcomings in the operation of the specific programs? To pose such a question is not to derogate what is being undertaken, but it does raise the issue as to whether a greater base in conceptualization, long-term planning, and evaluative research than is presently the case is not indicated for the future?

5. We turn finally and briefly to the last question: What are some of the broad underlying issues in the field?

We have been dealing with such procedural problems as the choice of alternate programs, the manner of evaluating outcomes, the selection of teachers and acti-

vities. These represent issues of means assuming the ends—the ends being, to put it most sharply, to transform the pre-school lower-class child in accordance with the requirements of the prevailing school. But there are at least two troublesome issues with respect to this that need examination. The first is concerned with the nature of the transformation we are prepared to impose on the culturally deprived child, and the second with the character of the school that will presumably serve as the standard for the transformation.

We must go back to the definition of "culturally deprived." The concept of cultural deprivation assumes that there is a normative or dominant middle-class culture, and that some children are deprived of experience with *this* culture (not *all* culture). From this point of view, the middle class child is also culturally-deprived—deprived in relation to the values and experiences of *another* culture, say intimacy and cooperativeness as against aloofness and competitiveness. It is a *relational* not a quantitative concept, and cultural deprivation in the present context means only deprived of middle-class values, not necessarily good or plentiful values, and more especially of the values and experiences needed to get along in the school as it is currently constituted. It does not mean that the culturally deprived child necessarily has fewer values, nor that he may not have other values and experiences that are *assets.*

And this raises the first issue. Assume with Frank Riessman[23] among others that the lower class child *does* have certain assets in the way of values and experiences which are not only functional in his environment but are of intrinsic worth: "the cooperativeness and mutual aid that mark the extended family; avoidance of the strain accompanying competitiveness and individualism; equalitarianism, informality, and warm humor; freedom from self-blame and parental over-protection; the children's enjoyment of each other's company, and lessened sibling rivalry; the security found in the extended family and in traditional outlook" (p. 48). What will be the effect of imposing contrary middle-class attitudes such as achievement-anxiety on these assets and the child's functioning in his environment, especially if his environment remains as it is? Can a program of compensatory education for the disadvantaged even at its best be salutary in any ultimate way without altering the disadvantaged environment giving rise to the disadvantaged child? Will the ravages of poverty and discrimination on the child's conception of life and of himself disappear if Appalachia and Harlem are permitted to remain as they are?

The second issue is not unrelated to the first. Compensatory early education is predicated on the criterion of success in school as the measure of fruitful socialization; the children are to be raised according to the modes of behavior and thought rewarded in the classroom. But there are those who would say that the demands of the present elementary school are themselves contradictory: on the one hand, the school rewards complacency, conformity, and docility, and on the other, it implies later success through ingenuity, daring, and competitiveness. And more, it is defective educationally: it can hardly serve as a model. Thus, to mention only three or four observers reporting from different points of vantage, Bruno Bettelheim[3] suggests that "learning inhibitions can come from a child's desire for honesty and truth, and from trying to succeed in terms of his own life experience and of clear-cut desires and values"—do Sally, Tom, and Puff represent "honesty and truth in the light of his own experience" for the Negro child or for that matter for any child; Jules Henry[13] shows how relentlessly honest feeling and originality are stamped out in the elementary school by the prevailing rivalry which is at once stimulated and feared by the teacher herself; Patricia Sexton[24] points out how the femininity of the school, to use her term, "emasculates" the boys not only affectively but cogni-

tively; and Edgar Friedenberg[10] and Robert Hutchins[16] from their very separate frameworks raise the same issue: is the middle-class social and intellectual way of life as reflected in the school really a Given of the Natural Order, so to speak? In the face of this, one must ask: Can the standards of today's school be taken safely as the model for the transformation of the culturally-deprived child? Is this what we want for our children, or should not some thought be given as well, even in the present context, to the transformation of the school itself?

Let me summarize what I have tried to do, and add a comment by way of conclusion. I have attempted to indicate something of the history of cultural deprivation and education, and pointed out that it is by no means a new problem. What was not realized so much before was the crucial significance of the early experiences of the child. I sketched some of the empirical evidence for the effect of early experience on learning to learn and the educational consequences of the discontinuity between the experiences of the lower class child and the expectations of the school. I described the diversity of current compensatory pre-school programs and outlined some of the pertinent research. I then raised two types of issues: first, issues concerned with immediate operational problems like the selection of activities, teachers, and the evaluation of outcomes, and second, issues concerned with long-term underlying problems like the consequences of letting the objectives and values of the present school determine the criteria for the socialization of our children.

In raising these issues my intent was of course not to restrain our efforts in compensatory pre-school education. On the contrary, the intent rather was to encourage the kind of dialogue that will be equal to the seriousness and magnitude of the task. To consider alternatives of method and to recognize the possibility of unintended consequences now when programs are still in process of formation may avoid irrevocable commitments to be regretted later. In view of the magnitude of the task and complexity of the social, economic, and educational issues, there is no doubt that pre-school education will be costly in time, effort, and funds, and the question is often asked: How can we afford it? It seems to me this is the one question that needs no answer, for when one measures the present waste and pain in humankind against the vision of what might be, the more telling question is: How can we *not* afford it?

References


1 Bereiter, C., Osborn, J., et al., "An Academically-Oriented Pre-School for Culturally Deprived Children," Paper presented at the American Educational Research Convention, February 12, 1965.

2 Bernstein, Basil, "Elaborated and Restricted Codes: Their Origin and Some Consequences," paper given at the University of Chicago, March 6, 1964.

3 Bettelheim, Bruno, "The Decision to Fail," *School Review*, 69 (Winter, 1961), 377-412.

4 Bloom, Benjamin S., *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics*, New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1964.

5 Bloom, B. S., Davis, A., and Hess, R., *Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation*, New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1965.

6 Brown, B. R. and Deutsch, M. "Some Effects of Social Class and Race on Children's Language and Intellectual Abilities: a New Look at an Old Problem," paper read at Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, March, 1965.

7 Davis, Allison, *Social Class Influences upon Learning*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1948.

8 Deutsch, Martin, "The Influence of Early Social Environment on School Adaptation," Paper presented at the Symposium on School Dropouts, Washington, D.C., December 2-4, 1962.

9 Deutsch, Martin, "Facilitating Development in the Pre-school Child: Social and Psychological Perspectives," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 10 (July, 1964), 249-263.

10 Friedenberg, Edgar Z., *The Vanishing Adolescent*, Boston, Beacon Press, 1959.

11 Gray, S. W. and Klaus, R. A., *Early Training Project: Interim Report*, George Peabody College, Mimeographed, November, 1963.

12 Hebb, D. O., *The Organization of Behavior*, New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1949.
13 Henry, Jules, "Attitude Organization in Elementary School Classrooms," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, XXVIII (January, 1957), 117-133.
14 Hess, Robert D., "Educability and Rehabilitation: The Future of the Welfare Class," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, XXVI (November, 1964), 422-429.
15 Hess, Robert D., *Inventory of Compensatory Education Projects*, University of Chicago, School of Education, Mimeographed, 1965.
16 Hutchins, Robert M., *The Conflict of Education in a Democratic Society*, New York, Harper and Bros., 1953.
17 Irwin, O. C., "Infant Speech: the Effect of Family Occupational Status and of Age on Use of Sound Types," *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 13 (1948), 224-226.
18 Larson, R. G. and Olson, J. L., *Final Report: A Pilot Project for Culturally Deprived Kindergarten Children* (tentative draft), Unified School District #1, Racine, Wisconsin, Mimeographed, April 1965.
19 Lynd, R. S. and Lynd, H. M., *Middletown*, New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1929.
20 Milner, Esther, "A Study of the Relationship between Reading Readiness in Grade One School Children and Patterns of Parent-Child Interactions, *Child Development*, 22 (1951), 95-122.
21 Montague, D. O., "Arithmetic Concepts of Kindergarten Children in Contrasting Socio-economic Areas," *Elementary School Journal*, 64 (1964) 393-397.
22 Riesen, Austen, "The Development of Visual Perception in Man and Chimpanzee," *Science*, 106 (1947), 107-108.
23 Riessman, Frank, *The Culturally Deprived Child*, New York, Harper and Bros., 1962.
24 Sexton, Patricia C., "Schools Are Emasculating Our Boys," *Saturday Review*, XLVIII (June 19, 1965), 57.
25 Warner, W. L., Havighurst, R. J., and Loeb, M. B., *Who Shall Be Educated*, New York, Harper and Bros., 1944.
26 Weinart, D. P., Kamii, C. K., and Radin N. L., *Perry Pre-school Project Progress Report*, Ysilanti Public Schools, Ypsilanti, Michigan, Mimeographed, June, 1964.